REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 9 and 15 and cancelled claims 2 and 10 herein. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Support for the claim amendments is found in the specification, figures, and original claims. Accordingly, applicant submits that no new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments.

Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 11 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on Qin et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,620).

Referring to independent claim 1, as amended, the claim recites in part:

"determining whether the first site-specific value is equal to a site-specific event indicator value indicative of an occurrence of an event; and

if the first site-specific value is equal to the site-specific event indicator value, then generating a second software variable having both a first predetermined name and a value equal to a first standardized value indicating that an event has occurred, else generating a third software variable having both the first predetermined name and a value equal to a second standardized value indicating that an event has not occurred."

Referring to Qin et al., the reference is directed to a sensor validation apparatus. The reference, however, does not provide any teaching of: "determining whether the first site-specific value is equal to a site-specific event indicator value indicative of an occurrence of an event", as recited in claim 1 as amended. Further, the reference does not provide any teaching of: "if the first site-specific value is equal to the site-specific event indicator value, then generating a second software variable having both a first predetermined name and a value equal to a first standardized

value indicating that an event has occurred, else generating a third software variable having both the first predetermined name and a value equal to a second standardized value indicating that an event has not occurred", as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Because Qin et al. does not teach each every limitation of independent claim 1, and claims 3 and 6 which depend from claim 1, applicant submits that claims 1, 3 and 6 are allowable over this reference.

Referring to independent claim 15, as amended, the claim recites in part:

"code for determining whether the first site-specific value is equal to a site-specific event indicator value indicative of an occurrence of an event;

code for generating a second software variable having both a first predetermined name and a value equal to a first standardized value indicating that an event has occurred, if the first site-specific value is equal to the site-specific event indicator value"

Referring to Qin et al., the reference does not provide any teaching of: "code for determining whether the first site-specific value is equal to a site-specific event indicator value indicative of an occurrence of an event", as recited in independent claim 15 as amended. Further, the reference does not provide any teaching of: "code for generating a second software variable having both a first predetermined name and a value equal to a first standardized value indicating that an event has occurred, if the first site-specific value is equal to the site-specific event indicator value", as recited in claim 15 as amended.

Because Qin et al. does not teach each every limitation of independent claim 15, and claim 16 which depends from claim 15, applicant submits that claims 15 and 16 are allowable over this reference.

Referring to independent claim 9, the claim has been amended to include all of the limitations of dependent claim 10. In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim 9. Since claim 9, as amended, includes all of the limitation of original claims 9 and 10, applicant submits that claim 9 is in condition for allowance. Further, applicant submits that claims 11 and 14 which depend from claim 9 are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding the presently submitted response, applicant's attorney respectfully requests the courtesy of a telephone conference to discuss any matters in need of attention. If there are any additional charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: _____
John F. Buckert
Reg. No. 44,572
Telephone: (248) 524-2300 ext. 3109

Date: December 6, 2007